AN ANSVVER TO A LIBELL,

WRITTEN BY D. COSENS AGAINST THE GREAT Generall Councell of Laterane under Pope Innocent the third.

Wherein the many and great errors of the said D. Cosens, are manifested to the world.

By THOMAS VANE Doctor in Diuinity of Cambridge.

2. Tim. 3. 13.

But euill men and seducers shall waxe worse and worse, deceiuing, and being deceiued.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

Printed at PARIS Anno Dom. 1646.
With Permission & Approbation.

298-07

TO THE MOST NOBLE AND MOST ACCOMPLISHED Gentleman, Sr KENELME DIGBY, KNIGHT &c.

SIR,

I doe not dedicate this, craving your protection thereof against calumny, and censure: the greatest Princes (I know) cannot doe it; yea their owne persons are not censure-proofe against the meanest varlets. Nor hereby to engage you to any favour or defence thereof, beyond the direction of your owne judgment; your free minde (I know) disdaynes to stoope to such a lure, and mine to cast it out. Let the booke suffer its owne fate, for so it will; hee that finds fault with it, let him tell mee so; and if I cannot defend it, I will acknowledge the error. Nor to take occa-

ſion to flatter you; you are aboue it: and impoſsible attempts vanish euen in the vndertaking. Nor yet to pay you your due prayſe, I am below it; and Fame her ſelfe diſchargeth that debt, borrowing the tongues of all men for her helpe: But to teſtifie the honour I beare you, for your tranſcendent worth in your ſelfe; and the gratitude, for your great fauours to mee. It wants proportion (I confeſſe) to either; which proceeds from my pouerty of materialls: but as ſmall pictures compar'd with greater tables, ſo this (being all I haue to offer) may preſent mee as liuely, though not ſo largely

SIR,

Your moſt humble and
obliged ſeruant,
THO. VANE.

TO THE READER.

READER, Doctor Cosens (since his coming into these parts) hath writtē diuers papers against the Catholique doctrine and beliefe; and hath shewed them, or deliuered the substance of thē in discourse to diuers persons, thereby to draw them, or keepe them from the Catholique Communion; who not hauing ability or leisure to examine their truth, I beleeue, thought better of them than they deserued. These papers of his came afterwards into the hands of seuerall Catholiques, and each one answered that which hee hapned on, or which was (if any was) more particularly addressed to him; which is the reason that hee hath more answerers than one, though to them all, any one was more than enough. Amongst his papers, this against the fowrth Councell of Lateran came to my hands, to which I soone after returned a briefe an-

ſwer, and ſo the matter reſted; but hearing ſince that hee, and ſome that thinke well of him, haue triumphed in theſe his workes, as though hee had gayned great victories; that I might vndeceiue them, for ſo much as I vndertooke, (if at leaſt they will ſuffer it,) and to informe all others, that pleaſe to reade, I thought good à little to enlarge my former anſwer, and to print it with Mr. Carres. And others there are, at leaſt one other, that I know, who if hee thought fit to print what hee hath written in anſwer to Doctor Coſens, could perhaps diſcouer more corruptions of his than we haue done. But heere are more than enough to warrant vs to ſay of him, as [a] Abigal ſaid of Nabal; for by his deeds he makes true the ſignificatiõ of his name: and that they that rely on him, will bee like thoſe that leane on a broken reedy ſtaffe, which will run into their hands, and wound inſteed of ſupporting them.

1. kings 5. 25.

D. C.

OF THE GREAT GENE-rall Councell of Lateran vnder Innocentius the third; said to bee *Maximum & celeberrimum Concilium*, *Anno Domini* 1215.

MAXIMVM, for the number of eight hundred Priors and Abbots (who had no voyces in Councells but by priuiledge from the Pope) was as great againe as the number of the Bishops. Celeberrimum, *for it was euery where famous for this one thing of speciall note in it, that so many men met together to no purpose; met, but did nothing. Therfore of this so Great and so famous a Councell, these be the words of Platina, (who was the Popes owne Secretary,) in vita Inno-*

cent. III. Venere multa tum quidem in consultationem, nec decerni tamen quicquam apertè potuit, quòd & Pisani & Genuenses maritimo, & Cisalpini terrestri bello inter se certarent. Eò itaque proficiscens tollendæ discordiæ causa Pontifex, Perusii moritur. *And to the same purpose are the words of Matth. Paris* (in Historia minori) *who liued in the same time when this Councell was called together.* Concilium illud Generale, quod more papali, grandia prima fronte præ se tulit, in risum & scomma desiit, quo Archiepiscopos, Episcopos, Abbates, Decanos, Archidiaconos, omnesque ad id Concilium accedentes ludificatus est. (*For after the Pope was gone to appease the tumults betweene the Genuenses and them of Pisa, there was nothing done*) Et cum nihil geri in tanto negotio cernerent, redeundi ad sua cupidi, veniam sigillatim petierunt. Quibus Papa non concessit, antequam sibi grandem pecuniam promisissent, quam a mercatoribus Romanis prius accipere mutuò, Papæque soluere coa-

cti sunt, antequam discedere Roma potuissent. Papa iam accepta pecunia, quæstuosum Concilium dissoluit gratis, totusque Clerus abiit tristis.

ANSWER.

It was called, *Maximum*, you say, for the number of eight hundred Priors and Abbots, (who had no voyce in Councell but by priuiledge, from the Pope) was as great againe as the number of the Bishops. Tis true that it was iustly called *maximum* partly for this reason, though not for this only, for the number of voyces, not only of Bishops who haue their suffrages by common right, but euen of Abbots and Priors, who haue theirs by the Popes grant, doth mainly contribute to the greatnesse of a Coũcell. Yet suppose the greatnesse of this Councell be to be measured by the nũber of Bishops only, how many can there be named greater? but very few in the world; and therfore it may well be called, *Maximum*. And *Cele-*

berrimum alſo; not, that ſo many met together, but did nothing, (as you ſay;) but becauſe there were preſent the Pope in perſon, two Patriarchs in perſon, and the other two by their Legats, the Greeke and Roman Emperours by their Legats, the Ambaſſadours of the kings of France, Spaine, England, Hieruſalem and Cyprus, with others; as I ſhall proue anon. But if to be famous for doing nothing, and for being to no purpoſe deſerue the title of *Celeberrimum*, theſe goodly obiections, when they are well knowne, will iuſtly beare that title on their brow.

You further tell vs, that Platina (whoſe words you cite) was the Popes owne Secretary: and you doe it either to no purpoſe, or elſe to inſinuate, that therfore hee was more knowing in the truth of the ſtory, or the more faithfull hiſtorian, or both. For the former, it had indeed beene likely, if hee had beene Secretary to the Pope, vnder whom this Councell aſſembled, as any one would thinke you meant,

meant, when you added this note in ſuch a weighty parentheſis. But certaine it is, that Platina was borne many yeares after the celebration of this Councell, and died in the yeare 1481. which was aboue 260. yeares after this Councell; as ſaith Trithemius de ſcriptorib. Eccleſ. as hee is cited in the workes of Platina, the page before the Epiſtle. This therfore is but a deceiptfull inſinuation of yours. Or if you did not ſay this with intent to deceiue others, but were your ſelfe deceiued; ſurely your care to informe your ſelfe well before you write, is very ſmall. Beſides if it were true, that hee had beene the Popes *owne* Secretary, as for greater *emphaſis* you expreſſe it, yet his authority cannot counterpoyſe the authority of all that are of a contrary mind, (to that you thinke Platina was of,) whom I shall by and by produce. And laſtly Platina doth not affirme to the prejudice of this Councell, that which you erroneously imagine hee doth, as I shall preſently shew. As for his

faithfullneſſe, I doe not thinke you will make his being the Popes owne Secretary an argument therof; men of your coate are not ſuch honourers of the Pope.

Now for the words themſelues of Platina, you misvnderſtand them; for you apply thoſe words, *nec decerni tamen quicquam aperte potuit*, generally, to the whole buſineſſe of the Councell, whereas the intent of them, at the moſt, is but particular concerning the Holy Land, as the fore-going words doe shew, which are theſe: *At Pontifex vbi videret Saracenorum potentiam in Aſia concreſcere, apud Lateranum, maximum Concilium celebrat. Venere multa tum quidem in conſultationem, nec decerni tamen quicquam aperte potuit, quod & Piſani & Genuenſes maritimo, & Ciſalpini terreſtri bello inter ſe certabant.* Theſe words then, *nec decerni tamen quicquam aperte potuit*, are at the moſt to bee referred to the buiſineſſe of the Holy Land, of ſending ayde thither, and making reſiſtance againſt the Turkes in Aſia, and to

nothing elſe. And the reaſon why nothing could bee decreed in that matter, was the warres hee mentions, which could not bee a hindrance from their making of other Canons in that Councell.

And as it is apparent enough, that this at moſt, was the meaning of Platina, to wit, that nothing was decreed concerning the Holy warre; and that therfore this place makes nothing to your purpoſe, who hereby would make voyde all the Canons of this Councell; ſoe it is alſo apparent that Platina (if ſoe much was his meaning) was deceiued euen in that; and that there was ſomething decreed concerning the ſending of aſſiſtance to the Holy Land, as appeareth by the decree of the Expedition, which is at the end of the Canons, whoſe truth I ſhall further proue by and by. Yea, and that Platina did not ſoe much as deny the decree of the Expedition, in his words, *nec decerni quicquam apertè potuit*, is very probable; for then hee would rather haue ſaid, *nec decerni*

quicquam potuit, absolutely; but his qualification of it by the word *apertè*, seemes to grant that something was done, though not *apertè*. And that something was decreed, is manifest by that which I shall say hereafter; what then hee meanes by these words, *nec apertè*; in that which was decreed, is not manifest. Perhaps by Decree, hee meanes the execution of the Decree, in actuall warring against the Turkes, wherein there was nothing openly done, whatsoeuer might bee secretly done tending to their preiudice. If this bee his meaning, (as no other can bee with truth in the thing) then, though his words bee obscure, and improper to signifie thus much, yet his meaning is true, but nothing to your purpose.

But Nauclerus doth open this obscurity, and makes it cleere against you; for hee speaking of the same businesse, and vsing the same words with Platina, in the rest, insteed of Platina's *apertè*, hee saith *aptè*; [b] *nec decerni tamen quicquam aptè potuit, quod & Pisani & Genuenses &c.* There could

[b] *Vol. 2. p. 914.*

nothing bee fitly, conueniently, and to the purpose decreed in regard of the tyme because of the warres in Europe. And immediatly after hee saith, (to confute that which you say, that there was nothing done heere) *Edita tamen nonnulla constitutiones referuntur*, but there are diuers constitutions declared to bee made.

As for Matthew Paris his *Historia minor*, I cannot meet with it, and in the volume of his whole workes both *maior* and *minor*, set forth lately by D. Wats of London: I can finde no such words as you cite. And if you had beene willing that your quotation should haue beene examined, you would haue giuen a man a neerer ayme than a whole history, whether *maior* or *minor*, to finde it in, especially in a quotation so important to your mayne designe; vnlesse you meant to giue a man more trouble than is faire in one that writes a controuersie. The like you haue also done in some of your following authorities. But if these words, *Et cum nihil geri in tanto*

negotio cernerent, which are all that concerne your purpose, bee to bee found in him, hee speakes of the same expedition of the Holy Land, and of the execution therof, not of the Decree it selfe, as the word *geri* will aswell beare in its signification: and if hee meãt otherwise hee had no good intelligence in the businesse, (as I shall presently proue;) for though hee liued in the same time of this Councell, yet hee liued in a farre distãt place. And his words, *in tãto negotio*, doe surely poynt at some one particular matter, which though it haue beene the occasion of calling many Councells, yet when the Prelats were met, they discussed and decreed many other things for the good of the Church. Soe that though it bee true that nothing was executed in the great businesse of the Holy warres, by reasõ of the warres in christẽdome, yet it is farre frõ prouing that which you soe boldly affirme, that neither the Decree of the expedition for the Holy Land, nor any one Canon was made in this Councell. *They met* (say you)

but did nothing; nor haue you (I am ſure) done any thing againſt them. And that you may further ſee the integrity of this your Author, in matters concerning the perſon of this Pope, (which is the purport of all the other words by you alleadged out of him,) reade Baronius in his laſt tome, anno 1197. who telleth vs, that this Matthew Paris ſeemeth to haue vrit his hiſtory of purpoſe to take occaſion to ſclander the Popes; and then reciting a ſtory, concludeth thus. *Vidiſti Lector Paris ingenium, animique male compoſiti malam ſententiam, res fingere, verbaque formare indigna Romano Pontifice, & ab hoc vno tam patenti mendacio cætera diſcas, & caueas videasque qua tunc ſit homo fide dignus, cũ totus ſit in carpendis Rom. Eccleſ. Pontificibus.* And therfore his accuſation of the Pope for exacting a great ſumme of mony of the Councell, firſt as it is impertinent to your buſineſſe, (for his couetouſneſſe could not nullifie the Canons of the Councell) ſo alſo is it moſt vnlikely to be true, becauſe Paris

is recorded for a ſlanderer, and Pope Innocent III. for a worthy and excellent man.[d] Nauclerus calleth him, *vir doctrina & moribus inſignis.* And Platina, in his life, ſaith, *conſtat eum in quouis genere vitæ probatiſſimum fuiſſe, dignumque qui inter Sanctos Pontifices cenſeatur.* And againe in the next words to thoſe you cite, *cuius vita adeo probata fuit, vt poſt eius mortem, nihil eorum quæ in vita egerit, laudauerit, improbaueritque, immutatum eſt.* The ſame alſo ſaith Nauclerus; and adds, *quin & religionis apprimè ſtudioſus.* But you are glad to cite any thing to the diſparagement of a Pope, though there be no colour of truth for it.

d *Nauclerus vol. 2. p. 876.*

Now that nothing at all was done in this Councell, which is the mayne matter you driue at,[e] & for which you haue misinterpreted the meaning of Platina and Paris, is very vntrue. Which I proue, firſt by the authority of Gregory IX. who liued in the time of this Councell, and was created Pope but about eleuen yeares after, and commanded the Decrees ſhould be

e *Vol. 2. p. 915.*

be put in the body of the Canon law, wherein hee vſed the ſeruice of Raymundus, of whom Platina thus writeth, [c] *Raymundum autem Barchinonenſem, quo adiutore in compilando libro Decretalium, Gregorius vſus eſt, ita quidam tàm laudant, vt maiori commendatione laudari nemo poſſit.* And Binius in the life of the ſayd Gregory IX ſaith that this Raymundus was Canonized by Clement VIII.

[c] *In vita Greg. IX. fine.*

So ſay the Annal Eccleſ poſt Baron tom 13. p 419 XV.

Secondly, I proue it by the teſtimony of the greateſt Diuines of that age, S. Thomas, and S. Bonauenture, who ſpeaking of the precept of yearly confeſſion, ſay that the Church did inſtitute it, and the Fathers command it in this Councell.

S Thom. 4. ſent. diſt. 17. q 3. art. 1 ad tertiam.

S Bonau. 4. ſent diſt. 17. q. 2. arg. 3.

Thirdly, by the teſtimony of the Councell of Trent, which ſpeaking of the ſame Decree, calls it, *the conſtitution of the great Lateran Councell.* And that the Acts of this Councell were alwayes extant, and are not counterfait, appeares, in that they now are, and haue beene in the body of the Canon law, euer ſince the time of Greg.

Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 14 can. 8.

IX. who commanded them to be inserted; and *f anno 1234.* which were but nineteene yeares after the Councell, approued the collection. Neither could any man haue meanes to know the truth of the Canons better than hee, the Councell hauing beene held not long before, by his vncle, in that citty, where hee being Pope could command the sight of all the monuments; and many were still aliue who had beene present in the Councell celebrated but nineteene yeares before the publishing of these Canons, & knew therfore what was done in it, better than those who were further remoued, either in time as Platina was, or in place as was Matthew Paris, if they had (as yon suppose) said any thing against it. Nor was it likely that Pope Gregory either would or could haue obtruded them before the eyes of such great Prelats and Princes, for decrees made in Councell, had they not beene so indeed. Nor would the Church (the things there determined soe much concerning her) nor they

f Annal. Eccles. post Baron. tom. 13. anno 1234. XV.

who did ſoe much emulate her proceedings, haue beene ſilent, had ſuch a thing beene attempted.

Laſtly I proue that there were Canons made in this Councell, yea and that thoſe Canons were receiued in England, (a thing which you deny towards the end of your diſcourſe) by a generall Coūcell (ſo it is ſtiled) of England, held at Oxford, by Stephen Archbishop of Canterbury, in the yeare 1222. which was but ſeuen yeares after this of Lateran, and about 12. yeares before the Canons therof were put into the Decretalls by Gregory IX. where towards the end it is ſaid, g *Vt autem omnia ſine bono concludantur, Lateranenſe Concilium ſub ſanctæ recordationis Papa Innocentio celebratum, in præſtatione decimarum in aliis capitulis præcipimus obſeruari.* But this is not all you haue to ſay againſt this Councell;

f *Matth. Paris. hiſt. ma. anno* 1222.

g *Binÿ Cōcil. tom. 7. part. 2. 2. fol.* 833.

C.

There be many things beſides, which may make vs iuſtly to ſuſpect the authority of this pretended great Councell. For

first, before Cochlæus put it forth, it was neuer extant; and it was but lately neither that hee put it forth, in the yeare 1538. Three yeares before, whē Merlin put forth the Councells, there was no such Councell, that hee met withall, to set out; it is not in his edition. But Cochlæus (a man not so well to be trusted, & who feigned many things in writing Luthers life) tells vs, that hee had the Decrees of this Councell out of an antient booke; but where hee got that booke, or who first compiled it, or of what authority it was, hee tells vs nothing at all. It is most likely, that antient booke was no other but the booke of the Popes Decretalls, where those things that are said by him to be decreed in this Councell, are heere and there scattered in seuerall places. Those scatterings (I believe) did Cochlæus, or some other, collect together, and made vp one body of them in manner and forme of a Councell. But so ill-fauored a forme hath hee giuen it, that often it betrayeth it selfe not to be genuine, and taken out of any authenticke coppy.

ANSWER.

¶ You further say, that there are many things besides, which may make you iustly suspect the authority of this *pretended* great Councell, as you are pleased to call it. I easily beleue that there are many things that make you not only to suspect, but flatly to reiect the authority of this and many other Generall Councells, but none iustly. But it is not the authority of this Generall Councell, (which is the same in all,) but the verity of the Canons and Decrees therof (you would haue sayd) and the authority of thē that affirme those Decrees, that you with so much sagacity suspect. And if you thinke the Councell and the Canons thereof but pretended, which are acknowledged true by the voyce of all the Catholiques of the world, what shall make them to be accounted reall? or shall the voyce, of one pretended Deane diminish their reality? And if you thinke this Councell but pretendedly Great, which consisted of the greatest num-

ber, of the greateſt perſons both Eccleſiaſticall and ſecular, that euer met together in the world, I muſt needs thinke that the common ſence and vnderſtanding of a man, is in you but pretended. Doth not Platina *the Popes owne Secretary*, cloſe by the words cited by you, ſay, *Pontifex apud Lateranum, maximum Concilium celebrat?* And doth not your owne Mathew Paris, in the words by you cited, ſay *Concilium illud Generale?* beſides many more and better witneſſes. And can you after all this, call it ſoe ſcornefully a pretended Great Councell? yea no Generall Councell, no Councell at all? as you doe in the latter end of your pamphlet. Surely you are Goliath that defie the whole hoſte of Iſraël, yet euery one, though as little as Dauid, is able to cut of your head, with your owne ſword.

Now the grounds of your ſuſpition, wherby you would diſmount the Canons of this great Councell, are ſo feeble, that they ſhew you are no skilfull enginier. Wherof one is, be-

cauſe Merlin hath it not in his edition, hee could not meet with it, to ſet it forth. But this is a poore argument; for firſt wee know that there were many other Councells which Merlin could not meet with, which haue ſince beene put forth, and Proteſtants I thinke will not deny, that there were ſuch, as the ſecond of Nice, fower of Lateran, two of Lions, one of Vienne, and one of Florence; and this of Florence was celebrated later than any that hee ſets downe, and was the laſt Generall one, that was held before his publishing of his booke, about fowerſcore yeares before it. And yet it ſeemes that hee could not meet with the Records of this Councell, or elſe hee did purpoſely omit it, which is not likely, how much more eaſy then was it for him to miſſe this of Lateran, which was held about 300. yeares before. Beſides, it is manifeſt that neither the world at that time, nor hee himſelfe did belieue, that hee had ſet forth all the Councells; as appeares by the king of France his Priuiledge at the beginning of his worke, and

his owne words at the end of his Epistle before the second volume. The words of the kings Priuiledge are these, *Concilia quæ in Ecclesia à temporibus Apostolorum vsque ad concessum Basilienſem celebrata potuerunt coaceruari*, by which it appeares that as they were all that they could then get, so they were not absolutely and certainly all that were. The words of Merlin himselfe are these. *Nam si authentica, integra, solida, & à mẽdis expertia fuerint exẽplaria, vnde hæc fideliter excerpta sunt, apprime castigata sunt, pura, vera, & sincera quæ profero, suorũ Archetyporũ quidem germanam conditionem præ se ferentia, quæ si grato animo tuleris, propediem (confide) ampliora nostris te sudoribus assecuturum:* by which it likewise appeares that hee did belieue that there were diuers others which hee had not set downe. Now for you to inferre that because hee could not meet with this Councell of Lateran, therfore there was none such, is a very vniust consequence, and is as strong against the eight other aboue named, as against this. Another

Another ground of your shrewd ſuſpition is, becauſe Cochlæus firſt put it forth, and becauſe hee put it forth but lately; ſoe that you obiect both againſt the perſon, and againſt the time. For the perſon of Cochlæus, you ſay, hee was not a man ſo well to bee truſted; and to make that probable, you ſay, that hee feigned many things in writing Luthers life. Againſt the time of Cochlæus his edition you obiect, becauſe it was lately ſet forth, to wit, in the yeare 1538. three yeares after Merlin ſet forth his edition of the Councells. I will firſt conſider the truth of what you ſay, and then the force therof. Concerning Cochlæus his edition of this or any other Councell, I can find nothing, but that Bellarmine in his controuerſies reckons him amongſt ſuch as haue writ of the Councells, yet hee doth not reckon it amongſt the catalogue of his workes, in his booke de Script. Eccleſ. nor can I find it heere in Paris. Yet taking what you ſay in this for granted, I doe not find that

hee was a man leſſe to be truſted than Merlin, or any other; for Bell: calleth him, *Vir doctiſsimus, & fidei Catholicæ propugnator eximius;* and therfore you who traduce a man without any proofe are much leſſe to be truſted than he: yea than any man I know, for your many falſifications, proued both in this and your other writings. As for your ſaying that *hee faigned many things in writing Luthers life*, that is but a new ſlander which as you doe not offer to proue, ſo it is impoſſible you ſhould; for how can you know the heart of another mā from whence his faigning muſt proceed? Hee may indeed write that which is falſe, but that hee did ſo by his owne fiction, and not by others misinformation, you cannot be aſſured, vnleſſe hee himſelfe had confeſſed it, which you doe not proue that hee hath. Nor doe you proue ſo much as that hee hath written any thing falſe of Luther.

You alſo ſuſpect Cochlæus his edition of the Councells in regard of the time, becauſe hee ſet it forth lately.

And what I pray, is lately? you ſay, the yeare 1538. which is a hundred and eight yeares agoe. Indeed in compariſon of the Apoſtles times it is but lately, but in compariſon of the inuention of printing, which was but about two hundred yeares agoe, and according to the ordinary account of ſchollers in editions of bookes, I belieue none will account a booke ſet forth a hundred and eight yeares agoe, a thing lately ſet forth. Much leſſe haue you reaſon to accoũt it ſo, ſeing you doe not account Merlins ſo, which yet (as you ſay) was ſet out but three yeares before. It is a paradox to ſay, Merlin an antient writer in the yeare 1535. Cochlæus a late writer in the yeare 1538. Can three yeares odds in a hundred and eleuen make one to be called late, and therfore to be (as you ſay) ſuſpected, and not the other? Surely if this your argument of lateneſſe be good againſt one, it is ſo againſt both; wherby you may, according to your prudence, ſuſpect all the Councells ſet forth by

Merlin. But I will giue your ſuſpition yet more ſcope; for Merlin published the Councells in the yeare 1524. as appeares by the laſt words of the whole worke; ſo that Cochlæus his edition was full fourteene yeares after Merlins, according to your computation of Cochlæus. And now to turne the poynt of your argument vpon your ſelfe, this laterneſſe of Cochlæus is ſo farre frõ being a ground of ſuſpitiõ, that it is (by iuſt ſo much) a ſtronger confirmation of the truth and exactneſſe of his worke. It was but by accident that the Councells were printed at any time; they might haue beene let alone till this preſent yeare, or not printed at all, would that haue made you ſuſpect the truth of them all? it would then haue made the world ſuſpect you for à very weake man, or rather haue put you below all ſuſpition. But it ſo falling out that the Councells were printed at ſeuerall times, by the care of ſeuerall men, the later they were printed, the more meanes had the publisher to make further

ſearch, and to enforme himſelfe out of the Manuſcripts more fully; as wee find, that in all editions of bookes, the lateſt (if the publisher apply due diligence) are moſt full, moſt pure, and moſt correct. I hope you will not ſay that the late edition of S. Chryſoſtome by Sr. Henry Sauill, is therfore the more ſuſpitious. So that heere is neither truth in the grounds of your ſuſpition, nor reaſon that this laſt should be any ground, though it were true.

You ſay moreouer, that Cochlæus ſayes, that hee had the Decrees of this Councell out of an antient booke, but where hee got that booke, or who firſt compiled it, or of what authority it was, hee tells vs nothing at all. And you adde your coniecture, as weake as your former ſuſpition, that it is moſt likely, that that booke was the Popes Decretalls, where the ſuppoſed Canons of This Councell are ſcattered in ſeuerall places. Concerning Cochlæus I can ſay nothing, ſeeing I cannot meet (as I ſaid before) with this his

worke that you cite, but I will fauour you so farre as to suppose you say true, & thē cōsider the purpose of it, which indeed is none at all. But for that hee had it out of an ancient booke is much to his purpose, which booke (I will be bold to coniecture, seeing you are so for your liking) was the very Originall of the Councell it selfe; and where hee got it, is impertinent for you to demand. And for this my coniecture I will giue you good ground, this, that in Crabs edition of the Councells I finde an Epistle to the Reader before the beginning of this Councell, the title wherof is this; *Bartholomeus Laurens Nouimagensis, Lectori;* the beginning of the Epistle this. *Hæc sunt quæ ex Archetypo illo cuius supra mentio fit, lectu adeo difficili, summo labore descripsimus; quæ si cui grata & vtilia fuerint, primum gratias agat Deo, qui horum qualecunque exemplar hucusque seruauit; deinde F. Petro Crab, qui hoc ipsum vt inter Cōcilia ederetur, procurauit.* And this perhaps is the preface which you mention hereafter and as-

cribe to Cochlæus, for other I finde not. But whoſe ſoeuer it was, it proues thus much, that this Councell (which was firſt published (that I can find) by Peter Crab) was taken out of the Original Record, than which there can be no better authority; and ſo hee ſaith againe in the body of his Epiſtle, *certè in editione hac ſedulo curatum eſt, ne quicquam ei ab Archetypo alienum ingeri poſſet.* And in this edition is the Decree of the expeditiõ, and the others, which in particular you hereafter ſeeke to nullifie, wherby thoſe obiections are beforehand anſwered; yet I will ſay more when I come to them. But ſuppoſe the Decrees of this Councell had beene taken out of the Popes Decretalls (the originall being loſt, as were the Canons of the firſt Councell of Nice, which makes ſo much vncertainty about the number of thẽ) into which they were inſerted (as I shewed before) by Gregory the ninth, but a few yeares after they were made; in ſeuerall places, according to the ſeuerall titles to which they were

to be referred (which you disgracefully call scattering) what impeachment is this vnto their credit? The Popes Decretalls are a testimony of no small reputation amongst all learned Christians. And why I pray scatterings? the Decretalls are not a collection of the Councells, that so you should expect euery Canon in his order, but à digestion of the Canons of all the Councells that pertayne to one matter, vnder one head; like the collection of the Statutes of England by Rastall and others; (out of which if one would vndertake to extract all the lawes made in Queene Elizabeths raigne, hee must looke perhaps in a hundred seuerall places) which yet I thinke you will not call scattering, but methodicall digestion. Bnt these are the reproaches throwne vpon the chiefe spirituall father of the Christian world, by those whom God hath (like Symeon and Leui) for the cruell schisme they haue made in the Church, *diuided in Iaacob and scattered in Israel.* But from whence soeuer

soeuer the first publisher of this Councell tooke the Canõs thereof, certaine it is that they were acknowledged, and ascribed to this Councell, by a testimony aboue all exception, namely, of the whole clergy of England in a Councell at Oxford, as I haue shewed before, & that, 12. yeares before the booke of the Decretalls was compiled. So that from the Decretalls is not the first view that wee haue of the Canons of this Councell.

You againe repeat, and say, Those *scatterings* (you belieue) Cochlæus or some other did collect together, and made vp one body of them in manner and forme of a Councell. But so ill fauoured a forme hee hath giuen it, that it often betrayeth it selfe not to be genuine, and taken out of any authentique coppie. Euen now you sayd (without doubt) that it was Cochlæus that set forth this Councell, now, it was hee or some other; and this I must needs grant is very true; for if it be set forth, certainly it was either by one or another. And if it were not Coch-

læus, then haue you loſt much labour in ſeeking to poyſon his credit herein. And if it were ſome other, then is your decrying this Councell by reaſon of this edition of Cochlæus, of no force, for then I affirme, that this *ſome other*, was a man of the greateſt credit of all other, and ſo the caſe is cleere againſt you, out of your owne words, and you ſay nothing heere to impeach the credit of this other; which I wonder at, for you may aſwell ſpeake againſt you know not whom, as ſay you know not what, as you doe in all this diſcourſe. You tooke it ill of Cochlæus that hee did not tell you where hee had that antient booke; and haue not wee much more reaſon to take it ill of you, that will not tell vs who it was that firſt put forth this Coũcell you ſo much finde fault with, nor giue vs any ayme to finde out this editiõ you meane (written by you know not whom) from any other? but although you heere fayle vs, yet you thinke you come home to vs in that which followes;

and although you know not who firſt put forth this Councell, and that wee know that both firſt and laſt haue done it in the ſame manner; yet without relation to the publisher, the very forme of this Councell, you ſay is ſo ill fauoured, that it often betrayeth it ſelfe not to be genuine, and taken out of any authentique coppy. Which deepe charge of yours againſt this Councell will recoyle vpon your ſelfe, and by the ill fauoured forme therof, betray it ſelfe not to be ſchollerly, nor taken out of any authentique coppy, either of reaſon or authority.

C.

For ſecondly, who will beliue? who can perſuade himſelfe, that this Councell of Lateran ſhould cite the Councell of Lateran in the Decrees and Canons which were there compiled? that is, that it ſhould cite it ſelfe, as a Councell not now ſitting, but paſſed and held a long time (or ſome time at leaſt) before it? The ſtile of other Councells vſeth to be, Hæc ſancta Synodus decernit, *or* placuit huic Sanctæ

Synodo, *as a seſsion now in being, when they make their Decree. But this Councell of Lateran ſpeakes of it ſelfe, as of ſome other Lateran Councell, then was at that time ſitting,* Fuit, & noſcitur fuiſſe, *as of ſome decrees made before, ſix ſeuerall times together; once in the 11. chapt. twice in the 29. three times more in the 33. 46 and 61. Chapters.* In Lateranenſi Cõcilio pia fuit inſtitutione prouiſum. De multa prouidẽtia fuit in Lateranẽſi Cõcilio prohibitũ. Deuoluatur collatio ſecundum ſtatutum Lateranenſis Concilii. Et in Lateranenſi Concilio noſcitur fuiſſe prohibitum. *Will any man thinke theſe be the words of the Councell of Lateran it ſelfe?*

ANSWER.

Will any man thinke theſe be the words of a man that conſiders what hee ſayes? who will belieue, who can perſuade himſelfe, that a pillar of his ſect, should frame an accuſation againſt a Councell, which (to phraſe it moſt gently,) is (I belieue) the greateſt ouerſight that euer was yet committed in this kinde? You ſay that

this Councell while it was ſitting, doeth cite it ſelfe, as a Councell that had ſitten ſome while before; and to proue it you alleadge ſix places, wherein there is mentiō of the Councell of Lateran; and you moſt weakly imagine, that the Councell of Lateran there ſpoken of, is this Councell of Lateran that ſpeaketh. Know then (and a great ſhame it is that you ſhould be guilty of ſuch an ignorance, as not to know it before you framed this terrible obiection) that there were foure Councells of Lateran, (according to the moſt receiued opinion concerning the place) of which three were before this; and the Councell of Lateran cited in this, was that which was celebrated next before this, vnder Pope Alexander the third, in the yeare 1180, wherein all thoſe places you (more punctually than any other) doe alleadge, are to be found. And is it poſſible that you (who talke ſometimes, as if you had beene Secretary to all the Councells) could be ſo ignorant, as neuer to haue

read or heard of any Councell of Laterā but this, so that finding in this the Councell of Lateran cited, you should thinke this Councell cited it selfe? for if you had but read this Councell in Binius, you should haue found all these places by you cited, referred in the margēt to their particular chapters, in the former Councell of Lateran, vnder Alexander the third. Or if any man had forged this Councell (as you iniuriously to vs imagine) could you thinke him so silly a fellow, as to conceiue such a grosse absurdity as this, should steale away vnobserued? And if hee did not belieue hee should alwayes escape vndiscouered, (as to his eternall vnhappinesse, by your seuerer inquisition, hee hath not,) could you thinke him so foolish as to doe a thing in it selfe most absurd and impertinent, which had no end in it, (for it was all one whether this Councell cited the Councell of Lateran or no,) and which could arriue at no other end, but the ruine of that which was his maine

desigue, namely, the begetting of the worlds beliefe to this his edition of this Councell; to which he must needs foresee, that this would be the vndoubted ouerthrow?

But howeuer, you make bold to slight and traduce some particular Catholiques, though most learned and vertuous, yet (to vse a frequent word of your owne, but much more seasonably) *I wonder how you dare*, so easily to condemne all Catholiques in generall; as to suppose that all the Popes, Catholique Bishops, Diuines, Canonists, and other learned men innumerable of the Catholique Church, yea those whose intereſt is mightily concerned in this Councell, euen all temporall Princes, whose Lay-dependants are not few in number, nor faint in courage, nor all defectiue in learning, but some of them very eminent therein, were all so blind to this grand absurdity as not to see it, if they were Clergy, not one amongst so many millions not to haue so much feare of the God of heauen nor honesty

as to discouer it; if they were of the Laity, not to haue so much regard to the God of this world, proper interest and to humane prudence, as to publish this prodigious forgery; but to suffer these Canons to be blanched ouer with the title of a great Generall Councell, and by that meanes currant through the world, vntill you with much industry and art, come and discouer this long hidden secret, and mystery of iniquity, to Catholiques eternall shame (as you surely thinke) and your owne eternall honour.

But now you may see, that when men with pride and obstinacy fight against the truth, they fall into that pit of shame and folly, that they prepar'd for others. Yea you goe on with more courage than foresight, thus;

C.

Therfore thirdly, Cochlæus is faine to excuse the matter by a coniecture, (in his preface to this Councell set forth by Crab) that these decrees were collected and brought into this forme, wherein hee presents them, by Pope Innocentius himselfe,

some

some while after the Councell was done. He cites three chap. of the Councell to that purpose, (three of those six that are named afore) and sayes, the Reader will easily deprehend asmuch. But what reader will like it well, that the decrees of a Councell should be written some while after the Coūcell is ended? It was alwayes the vse of Councells to write their owne decrees, and to signe them too, before they went away. And Innocent the Pope was not so weake a Scribe, as to make the Synode it selfe speake after such a manner, In Lateranēsi Concilio noscitur fuisse prohibitum; or, fiat hoc, secundum quod prouisum est in Lateranensi Concilio &c. *which certainly is not the stile of the same Councell concerning it selfe; Innocent the third knew well enough what belonged to it.*

ANSWER.

First you made Cochlæus guilty of a fowle fault, and now you bring him in making an excuse, and both falsely. First, I can finde no such coniecture as you speake of, and secondly if it were to be found, it is no excuse. You say

it is to be found in his preface to this Councell set forth by Crab; but wee may sooner gather the Sibylls leaues than finde it, for there is no such thing. There is indeed an epistle of Bartholomæus Laurens, which I haue mentioned before, & by which you were confuted, it being thereby proued that that edition was taken out of the originall, for which there needs no excuse. Besides, it is a thing in it selfe improbable, that Cochlæus who (as you say) wrote this Councell himselfe, should afterwards write a preface to another mans edition of the same Councell. But suppose this coniecture you mention (to wit, *that these decrees were collected and brought into this forme he presents them, by Pope Innocent himselfe, some while after the Councell was done*) be some where to be found; what excuse is this I pray, or what doth it excuse? If the coniecture be true, it confimes the whole cause against you: namely, that all these decrees were made in the Councell; if it be false, it is nothing. But you draw cõsequences

from hence which are certainly moſt pittifull and inconſequent, with which while you thinke to ſtrengthen your cauſe, you doe weaken the credit of your owne vnderſtanding.

You ſay, what reader will like it well; that the decrees of a Councell ſhould be written ſome while after the Councell is ended? And I ſay, what reader (but your captious ſelfe) will diſlike it? Indeed if the decrees of the Councell had beene written ſome while before the Councell began, you might iuſtly haue asked, who would haue liked it; but to aske who will like, that they ſhould be written afterwards, is moſt ridiculous. But you ſuppoſe, becauſe it is ſayd in the coniecture you alleadge, that they were collected and digeſted into the forme they are in, after the Councell was done, that therfore they were not written in any forme, no not at all in the Councell it ſelfe; to which purpoſe you ſay, that it was alwayes the vſe of Councells to write their owne decrees, *and to ſigne them too*, (as very pertinently you

adde) before they went away; intimating hereby, that they did not so in this Councell; and your reason is, because Pope Innocent did collect them into the forme they now are in, some while after the Councell was done. Surely you did not consider what all impartiall men would conceiue of your ability, seeing you make such an inference as this; so poore, that few in the world would haue made themselues guilty of the like. And I demand of all the world, whether the decrees of the Councell could not be written, *and signed too*, by, and in the Councell, and yet be brought into this forme, or method, wherein they now are, by Pope Innocent some while after? euery one that hath but common sense will conclude against you. Yea his collecting and putting them into a forme some while after, is à proofe (cleane contrary to what you inferre, namely) that they were written some where, and in some forme or other before. For otherwise from whence should Pope Innocent

collect these decrees? out of his memory? that is most improbable. Collection imports not the inuenting or making them, but the gathering of them out of some Records or other; and out of the originall it is most likely (if he gathered them at all) that he tooke his collection, seeing he liued in the time and place of this Counceil, and was present and president therein. Your argument then is no better than this, The Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles were collected and brought into a forme written and printed, againe and againe, after the first writers were dead and gone; therfore they were not at first written by themselues or their assignes.

You further labour to assoyle Pope Innocent from the guilt of forging these Decrees, (for you take it for graunted that they were forged, and Cochlæus you are most constant to, for the man that forged them,) because Pope Innocent was not so weake a scribe (you say) to make the Synode

quote it ſelfe; Wherein you might well haue ſpared your paynes, for *Quis (quæſo) vnquam vituperauit Herculem?* who, I pray, euer accuſed Pope Innocent hereof? you thinke Cochlæus doth, becauſe he coniectures (as you ſay) that theſe Decrees were collected and brought into this forme by Pope Innocent, after the Councell was diſſolued; as if to collect decrees, and bring them into ſome or other forme after the diſſolution of the Councell, were all one as to forge them? A conceipt ſurely vnworthy of any iudicious man. Innocēt the Pope (you ſay, and truly,) was not ſo weake a Scribe as to make the Synod quote it ſelfe, he knew well enough what belonged to it. Yet ſo vnhappy are you, that you cannot ſupport this truth, (which no body puts you to, by denying) but by affirming a greater falshood, namely, that this Councell doth cite it ſelfe. But if you had beene ſo good a Scribe, as to haue knowne aſwell what belongeth to the making of obiections againſt a Councell, as

Pope Innocent did the ſtile of Councells, you would I thinke haue kept your owne counſell, and beene more ſilent in this matter. But you goe on, and ſay.

C.

Wee had beſt therfore belieue Platina, non eſt decretum ibi quicquam; non potuit ibi decerni quicquam. Improbauit Innocentius ipſe Abbatis Ioachim libellum, damnauit ipſe Almericum. *He ſayes, It was not the Councell of Lateran that made any decrees to condemne them; but that Pope Innocent condemned them himſelfe. And wee may well conclude,* That both theſe and other things, de quibus nihil decerni potuit in Concilio, *were by the Pope ſet downe in his owne Decretalls: out of which he tooke thoſe Canons, whoeuer he was that compiled them into the forme of a Councell.*

ANSWER.

You ſay, wee had beſt therfore belieue Platina; which I graunt wee may doe, but not your ſenſe of his words, which I haue already refuted. But

what degree of truſt ſoeuer wee yeeld vnto Platina himſelfe, I am ſure wee had beſt giue none vnto you, in your citation of Platina, who haue wronged both him and vs, in all that you haue heere alleadged. All that he ſayes, is what you brought, and is anſwered in the beginning, *nec decerni tamen quicquã apertè potuit*; inſteed whereof you make him ſay, *non eſt decretum ibi quicquã; nõ potuit ibi decerni quicquã*; wherein beſides the explicatiõ and chãge of the words, you leaue out the mayne word *apertè*, which changeth the whole ſenſe. Platina ſaith, *nothing could be decreed openly*, you alleadge him ſaying, *there was not, nor could be any thing at all decreed*, whereas the decreeing of nothing openly, doth imply that ſomething was decreed, though not openly; and for the meaning of Platina's words, I referre the reader to the firſt paragraph, where I ſhew, that theſe words of Platina were ſpoken with relation to the buſineſſe of the Holy warres, and not concerning the decrees of this Councell.

And

And as heere you leaue out a word to the corrupting of the ſenſe, ſo in the following words which you alleadge, (as if they were placed in Platina as they are in you, and were a further proofe of the ſame aſſertion, whereas they haue no connexion together in ſenſe, and are aboue a dozen lines aſunder,) you put in a word, which is the very hindge on which the ſenſe is turned, and turned contrary to the aſſured truth thereof; and that is the word, *Ipſe, he himſelfe*, as if the condemnation of Almericus and the booke of Ioachim had beene the Popes act without the Councell, that ſo you might proue the Councell falſified, wherein the ſayd acts are recorded to haue paſſed. And then you adde as another ſaying of Platina, or as your conſtruction of the former words of Platina, *He ſayes, it was not the Councell of Lateran that made any decrees to condemne them, but that Pope Innocent condemned them himſelfe.* But Platina hath neither any ſuch formall words, nor are they the meaning of

the words he hath; for his saying the Pope did condemne them, doth not necessarily imply that the Councell of Lateran did not condemne them, for it might be done by both, either seuerally or together, and this latter way it was done, as I haue already proued, and doe now againe by the testimony of [a] Beluacensis, who speaking of this Councell saith, that the Abbot Ioachim and Almericus were condemned therein. So that you are *Ipse, He himselfe*, that haue falsified Platina, layd vniust obiections against the Councell of Lateran, and (*aperte*) *manifestly* condemned your selfe of fowle play by the euidence of the fact,

[a] Beluac. l. 30 hist. cap. 64.

For a close to this section, you say, wee may well conclude, that both these and other things *de quibus nihil decerni potuit in Concilio*, were by the Pope set downe in his owne Decretalls; out of which he tooke these Canons, whoeuer he was that compiled them into the forme of a Councell. Your conclusion is like your premis-

ſes, there is no truth in either of them both; you ſay, that both theſe and other things, (I ſuppoſe you meane all the Canons aſcribed to this Councell,) were ſet downe by the Pope in his owne Decretalls, that is, according to your meaning, inuented by the Pope, and put firſt into his Decretalls; for if they were firſt decreed in Councell, and afterwards put into the Decretalls, it is not for your purpoſe, but againſt you; and that it was ſo, I haue already ſufficiently proued; and doe yet againe by the title of theſe conſtitutions, as they are ſet downe in the Decretalls; which are not barely aſcribed to the Pope, as many others are; but to him in a generall Councell; thus, *Innocentius tertius in Concilio generali.* Wee may therefore well conclude; that your concluſion built on your extreme corruption of Platina, hauing ſo rotten a foundation muſt needs fall to the ground.

Laſtly you ſay, that he tooke them out of the Popes owne Decretalls, whoeuer he was that compiled the

Canons into the forme of a Councell. But I haue proued before, that he tooke them out of the originall Records of the Councell; and if he had taken them out the Popes Decretalls, it had bene well enough; thoſe Decretalls not being the Popes *owne*, ſingly, as you haue ſayd, but the Popes and Councells of Lateran together, as I haue many wayes proued. So that of all that you haue hitherto ſayd, there is not one word but is either vntrue, or impertinent; and to vſe your owne words, *de quibus nihil decerni poteſt*. Yet as if you had not ſayd enough of this nature, you goe on to make faults, in ſteed of finding them (as you ſuppoſe) in others. C.

For the third Canon of this Councell (concerning the excommunication of temporall Princes, and the Popes power to free their ſubiects from all obedience to them, and to giue away their kingdomes) is indeed one of the Extrauagants, cap. 13. de Hæreticis, that is, Pope Innocents owne Decree, and not the Councells of Lateran, vbi nihil de-

cerni potuit. *So in the 71. Canon, concerning the recouery of the Holy Land from the Saracens (for which this Councell was chiefly called, and met together) the compiler hath made the words to run in a Popes ſtile, and not in the ſtile of a Councell,* Ad liberandam terram ſanctam de manibus impiorum, ſacro Concilio approbante definimus, &c. *neither in the Councell was there any ſuch Decree made; as both Card. Bellarmine (againſt king Iames's Apologie,) and Eudæmon Cidonius* (in his Parall. Torti & Tortur.) *doe confeſſe out of Platina. He therfore that made theſe two decrees, of abſoluing ſubiects from obedience to their Princes, and of recouering the land of promiſe from the Saracens, may well be thought to haue made that decree alſo of Tranſubſtantiation, which hath made ſuch a noyſe in the world, and for which this Councell is ſo often quoted vnder the name of* Maximum omnium, Generale, & celeberrimum Concilium.

Anſwer.

The third Canon of this Coun-

cell, concerning the excommunication of temporall Princes, you say, is one of the Extrauagants, *cap. 13. de Hæreticis*, but you are very Extrauagant in saying so; for there is no such matter in the place by you cited, nor indeed any such place as you haue here rashly set downe. All that is to be found is this; that in the fifth booke of the Extrauagants, there is a Title *de Hæreticis*, vnder which title are only three chapters, and in them not a word of this matter. And this for the truth of your quotation; I will now consider the sense of what you say, and the truth thereof. The third Canon (say you) is one of the Extrauagants, that is, Pope Innocents owne Decree. By which it seemes, that it is the same thing with you, to be one of the Extrauagants, and to be Pope Innocẽts owne Decree; as if the Extrauagãts were Pope Innocẽts owne decrees; whereas it is apparãt by the titles to whom they are ascribed, that not one of them was made by Pope Innocent; so mightily are you mis-

taken in this matter. This Decree then is not Pope Innocents owne, and not the Councells of Lateran, as you ſay, but Pope Innocents owne, and the Councells of Lateran; his, in and with the Councell of Lateran, as I haue proued. You alſo cite your ſelfe (for it is to be found in no authour elſe) againſt the Councell of Lateran, ſaying, *vbi nihil decerni potuit, where nothing could be decreed*; againſt which I oppoſe (beſides all that I haue ſayd before) a man of much better authority, Albertus Crantzius, who ſaith [a] *Concilium maximum congregauit Lateranum; ibi multa conſtituta, quæ hodie extant in corpore iuris, there many things were decreed, which are at this day extant in the body of the law.*

[a] Crantz. Metrop. l. 9. cap. 1. ſect. Innoc. 3.

Moreouer the ſenſe of this Canon you doe lamely, and with change of the tearmes ſet downe; for there is no mention of kings nor kingdomes; and then the Popes abſoluing of the *vaſſalls of temporall Lords* (for thoſe are the words of

the Canon) from their fidelity to them, and expoſing their land to be occupied by Catholiques, expreſt to be but in the caſe of neglect to purge their land of hereſy, and continuance therein after excommunication by the Bishops, and after a yeeres contempt of making ſatisfaction; and then there is added this reſeruation alſo, *Saluo iure Domini principalis, &c. ſauing the right of the principall Lord, ſo that he giue no obſtacle hereunto, nor oppoſe any impediment.* Now this power of the Pope, whatſoeuer it be, is farre from that which your confuſed words inſinuate, which to your weaker readers (I ſuppoſe) will ſound, as if the Pope had power to abſolue the ſubiects of any kings from their fidelity, and diſpoſe of their kingdomes when, to whom, and for what cauſe ſo euer they pleas'd; which is nothing ſo. Yet if this power of the Popes were ſo vaſt as you belieue it, or would haue others to belieue it, why should it trouble you? And why should you be

be more tender of the intereſt of Princes than they themſelues, and all their courts about them, who either receiued this Canon immediatly from the Councell, as I haue ſayd and proued, or elſe ſuffered it to be coſeningly thruſt vpon them, as you haue ſayd, but not proued.

And I wonder that you a Proteſtant, should faſten vpon this decree of depoſing of Princes by the Pope, (to make the decrees of this Councell odious and incredible,) when as it is well knowne, that the Popes in ſixteene hundred yeeres, haue not depoſed ſo many, as Proteſtants in one hundred; for almoſt wherſoere the gangrene of that hereſy hath ſpread it ſelfe, they haue either actually depoſed and expelled their Princes, as in Swede, Denmarke, Scotland, Netherlands, Geneua; or diuers times attẽpted by violence to doe it, as in France often, in Bohemia, in Poland, and now it is feared in England. And if you ſay, that though theſe Puritane Proteſtants haue both taught and done

theſe things, yet the true Proteſtant of the Church of England, he neuer taught ſuch doctrine, he cānot thinke ſuch a thought without horror; ſurely wee haue nothing but your bare and often broken word for our ſecurity. For what experience hath the king, or his few predeceſſors of your religion had, that in caſe they ſhould haue depriued you of your deſires, as they denyed to graunt the deſires of the Puritanes, if they ſhould haue turned you out of your Bishoppricks and Deaneries, taken from you the Church vſurped Liuings, ſet vp a religion that would not haue endured wiuing preachers, what experience haue they had, that in theſe or the like caſes, your Proteſtants of the Church of England would not attempt their deſtruction, and if they were able, lay the axe on their necks, as your Supreme Gouuernour of your Church of England Queene Elizabeth and her inſtruments did, on the necke of the renowned Mary Queene of Scotland, and Dowager of France.

Can you then thinke much that the Pope, a perſon of an other quality, and more diſ-intereſſed than the ſubiects of Princes, ſhould haue ſome kinde of power, by all conuenient wayes to reduce and correct hereticall Princes? Eſpecially ſeeing the Emperours, Kings, and Princes gaue their votes vnto this Decree, and were, for ſo much as concerned themſelues, the makers thereof. But you will not belieue that this decree was made in the Councell, but thinke that you haue proued the contrary. My aduice then is that you acquaint the Kings and Princes on this ſide the ſeas, with this ſtrange cheat that is put vpon them; it is like to be a matter of high acceptation to them, of great reproach to their vnfaithfull ſeruants, that would not diſcouer that which you haue done, and of great prayſe and preferment to your ſelfe.

You further obiect againſt the Act of the expedition for the recouery of the Holy Land, (which you call the 71. Canon, but no body elſe doth ſo

that I know) becauſe it runnes, ſay you, in a Popes ſtile not in the ſtile of a Councell. By which I perceiue, that though you are one of the Court yet you are none of the Councell, for you are not skild in the ſtiles of Popes and Councells.

Otherwiſe you would haue knowne, that it is the manner in thoſe Councells where the Pope himſelfe is preſent, to decree things in his name, with this addition, *ſacro approbante Concilio*, as in the Councell of Florence *in literis vnionis*, euen as Acts of Parliament of England, are made in the kings name, *with the aduice or conſent of the two houſes*.

You ſay moreouer, that Card. Bellarmine and Eudæmon Cidonius doe confeſſe out of Platina, that there was no ſuch decree made. Your Eudæmon Cidonius I cannot meet with heere, nor is it much materiall, for that answer which ſerues your quotation of Bell: will ſerue him alſo, ſeeing (as you ſay) it is both their confeſſions out of Platina. For the finding of your citatiõs out of Bell: you vſe vs veryill,

giuing vs no direction, but a booke of perhaps twenty leaues in folio to finde out twēty words, which whē wee haue found, to recōpence ourpaynes, we finde your miſtake and falshood. For Bellarm. doth not ſpeake directly of the particular chapter of the expedition, whether that were made in the Councell or no, but of the buiſineſſe of the Holy Warre in generall, *de hoc articulo, cū multa diſputata fuiſſent, nihil certi definiri potuit*; and there is a difference ſure betwixt *nihil certi*, and *nihil omnino*, nothing certaine, and nothing at all, as you would haue it. And I ſuppoſe this *nihil certi* is meant in regard of the further and more particular managing of the warre, from which they were hindred by the preſent warre in Chriſtēdome, and which is no denyall of the Decree of the expedition, which conſiſts of a few generall heads concerning the rayſing of contributions to this great worke from the clergy, (wherein the Pope himſelfe gaue a great example) of punishments on thoſe that hindred it

and indulgence to them that aduanced it, with the like. All which though they were vndoubtedly decreed, yet it may be sayd with Bell: out of Platina, that after much disputation there was nothing certaine defined, in regard of the neerer and more particular articles for the managing of the warre, being put frō it by the present warre in Christendome. Yea it might be sayd *nihil certi* in regard of this decree it selfe, not of the letter and intention of it, but of the wars at home, yea rather the contrary was certaine, namely, that it was not executed. And if Platina (or Bellarmine out of him) had intended to exclude this Decree of the expedition (which is all that wee affirme to be done in that kinde) why did they expresse it with these reseruations, of *apertè* and *certi*, and not say directly and without limitation *nihil* as you doe? which had beene more plaine, and agreeable to the grauity of those writers. Therfore by these reseruations they must needs intend some thing, which (as I con-

ceiue) is that which I haue expreſſed. Howſoeuer, certaine wee are, that this Decree was made in the Councell, by all that proofe whereby wee haue proued the whole Councell, of which this is a part; and particularly (becauſe you heere make a particular obiectiõ againſt it) by Matth. Paris, who intimateth ſo much, by repeating [a] the ſubſtance of this very Decree, in almoſt as many words as they are in the Councell, which are too long to ſet downe heere.

[a] Matth. Paris hiſt. ma. p. 189.

Your further ſay, that he that made theſe two decrees, of abſoluing ſubiects from obedience to their Princes, and of recouering the land of Promiſe from the Saracens, may well be thought to haue made the decree of Tranſubſtantiation alſo. And you ſay truth in that, but it will not helpe you; for Pope Innocent made them all, but, *ſacro approbante Concilio*, that is, the whole Councell, conſiſting of the Pope and the reſt of the Prelats, decreed them Nor haue you reaſon ſo to boggle at the word Tranſubſtan-

tiation, or at this Councell for the word; seeing the thing knew no beginning since our Sauiour, as our Catholique bookes doe sufficiently proue; and euen the word it selfe was in vse before this Councell, as appeareth by *Roger Houenden in Henrico 2.* where he hath these words.[b] *Confessi sunt etiam, quod Sacerdos noster, bonus siue malus, iustus vel iniustus, corpus & sanguinem Christi posset conficere, & per ministerium huiusmodi Sacerdotis, & virtutem diuinorum verborum, quæ à Domino prolata sunt, panis & vinum in corpus & sanguinem Christi verè transubstantiantur.* Also by Blesensis, who was king Henry the second his Chaplayne, who saith[c] *Et vt gratia exempli, in vno Sacramentorum videas abyssum profundissimam, & humano sensui imperceptibilem, pane & vino transubstantiatis virtute verborum cælestium in corpus & sanguinem Christi &c.* Both these wrote in the dayes of Henry the second, and the Councell of Lat. was held in the dayes of king Iohn, who raigned the second after him. And in both these good

[b] Annal. p. 576.

[c] Blesens. ep. 140.

English

English authors, doe wee finde the word *transubstantiated*, applyed to the bread & wine chãged into the body & bloud of Christ; nor doe wee finde in any story, that these men were questioned for the vse of these words, as if they did import any thing more in their sense, than that which was the generall beliefe of that and the foregoing ages. It is not therfore the Decree of transubstantiation made in this Councell afterwards, which hath made such a noyse in the world, as you say it hath, but the heretiques and Schismatiques that haue opposed it.

Nor was this Coũcell for this decrees sake called *Maximũ omniũ, generale, & celeberrimum*, but becausse it was summoned by the Pope frõ all parts of the Christian world, and there met together the greatest and most renowned assembly both of Clergy and Laity, that euer was in the world: which therfore it ill becomes you to deride. In fine, the three particular decrees you heere oppose, but haue proued

nothing againſt them, are firſt inſerted into the Decretalls, which was done by Pope Gregory IX. not many yeeres after the Councell was held; who therein vſed the ſeruice of one of the beſt men of the world, as I haue proued before. Secondly, they are put into the number of the Canons of this Councell by Crab: who (as I haue alſo proued) tooke them out of the Originall Records. Thirdly, they are alſo reckoned amongſt the reſt of the Canons, by all others that haue made edition of this Councell, as Surius, Binius, and whoſoeuer elſe. Laſtly, they are receiued and allowed by the Catholique Church, the ſtrongeſt teſtimony of all others; and doe you thinke to ouerthrow them? Who is ſufficient for this? he therfore that attempts it, deſerues the name of *hæreticorum maximus omnium, generalis & celeberrimus.* In the next place, you inuade vs with an Arithmeticall argument; but when I haue reckoned with you, it will appeare that you are not a man of good account; for thus you caſt it;

C.

But as it should seeme, he that first composed it, and stiled it so, or afterwards set it forth, and entituled it a Generall Councell, had not his lesson perfect. For betweene the seuenth and the eighth Generall Councell, I trow there cannot another Generall Councell interueene, as this notwithstanding is made to doe, if it were so Great and so Generall, as they say it is. They count the second of Nice for the seuenth Generall, which was held in the yeare 787. and the Counceil of Florence (held in the yeare 1449.) for the eighth Generall, as is there, in the last session of it, expressly set downe: Finis octaui Concilii Generalis factus est 21. Iulii &c. *So that vnlesse they will make two eight generall Councells, this of Lateran could be none.* ANSWER.

You passe from the matter of this Councell, to disproue the title therof; and say, he that entituled it a generall Councell had not his lesson perfect, and that becausse (as you say) they count the second of Nice for the seuenth generall Councell, and the

Councell of Florence for the eighth, & betweene the seuēth and the eighth there cannot another interueene, as this is made to doe, if it were so great and so generall, as they say it is. Truly if he that published this Councell, had had his lesson no perfecter than he that made these obiections, he deserued to be whipt for a trewant, for neuer were there such idle obiections made. I pray who are these, *they*, that account the Councell of Florēce the eighth generall Councell? your reader cannot but thinke you meane vs Roman Catholiques, against whom you heere dispute, and whom you would make to appeare so simple, that they cannot tell eight. But it is not the Roman account, *I trow*, that you heere follow, but the schismaticall Grecian, who yet will giue you no more thankes for it, nor no more admitt you a member of their Church, than will the Catholiques. You must know then, if you did not before, that the eighth generall Councell was celebrated in Constantinople

againſt Photius, who made a ſchiſme betweene the Latin and Greeke Church, they of the ſchiſme reiected this eighth, and many other generall Councells, which were celebrated in the weſt; amõgſt which this fourth of Lateran (you ſo ſtrongly and weakly fight againſt) was one; vntill the Grecians meeting againe with the Latins in the Councell of Florence, the Grecians called that the eighth generall Councell; which yet ſoone after they reiected, and ſo at this day allow but ſeuen. But if men may receiue and reiect Councells at their pleaſure, then you may with the Lutherans allow but ſix; with the Eutychians which are yet in Aſia, but the firſt three; with the Neſtorians which are yet in the Eaſt, but the firſt two; with the Arrians and Trinitarians which are in Hungary and Poland, none at all. And this you and yours may doe with as good reaſon, as they doe reiect and reuile this of Lateran, and aboue all, the ſacred Oecumenicall Councell of Trent.

And that you may againe fall into the fault, of which you falsely accuse others; you are out in your computation of the yeeres of the holding of the Councell of Florence; but this I doe not mention as a matter of moment, it being brought in but on the by. But I cannot omitt a weighty passage that you haue a little before, where you say, that betweene the seuenth and the eighth generall Councell you trow, there cannot come another, if it were so great and so generall, as this is sayd to be. Wherby you intimate, that the greatnesse of this Councell was the hinderãce that it could not come betweene the seuenth and the eighth, and by consequence, that if it had beene a little one, it might haue come betweene; which is a very new and pretty fancy. A little generall Councell it seemes might haue crowded in betweene the seuenth and the eighth as an *appendix* to the former, or otherwise haue found place and vnion with it vnder the same name and

number of the ſeuenth, but this being ſo great and ſo generall, could not poſſibly finde a roome betwixt them, but that it muſt make two eights, as you ſay, rather than an eighth and a ninth, which ninth (if it had beene ſo, in this caſe) might yet haue beene called the eighth in ſome other reſpect, as I haue shewed. But I had thought that Councells in regard of number being of *diſcrete quantity*, did not require any place by reaſon of their greatneſſe, (as if they were in this regard, of *continued quantity* alſo,) more than if they had beene little: the abſtract number of eight, (I trow) can no more come in, betweene ſeuen and eight, in a ſmall ſubiect thã in a great; and therfore the greatneſſe of this Councell was no more hinderance to its coming in betweene the ſeuenth and the eighth, without chãging the name and order of the number, than if it had beene neuer ſo little.

You tell vs alſo, that in the laſt ſeſſion of the Councell of Florence

it is expreſſely ſet downe, *Finis octa-ui Concilij generalis, &c.* yet the words more expreſſely than you haue ſet thē downe are, *Finis generalis octaue Synodi*, which though not different in ſubſtance, yet the difference of the words *Concilium* and *Synodus* if you had vnderſtood the reaſon thereof, had beene enough to preuent your obiection. For it appeares by an epiſtle of Bartholomæus Abramus to the Archbishop of Rauenna, ſet downe by Crab at the beginning of this Councell, and by Binius at the end, that the Latin Originall of this Councell was loſt, and that this that is now extant, was tranſlated by the ſayd Abramus out of the Greeke, for which reaſon he vſeth the word *Synodus* according to the Greeke, & not *Concilium*; and it is called *octaua* becauſe it was ſo in the greeke which hee tranſlated; and the Greekes ſet it downe ſo, becauſe (as I ſayd before) they accounted no Councells generall, but where they themſelues were preſent and which they did receiue,

of

of which this was indeed the eighth. But this account is (for very good reasons) reiected by [a] Surius and [b] Binius, and by all Catholiques. And Crab though hee haue no *caueat* vpon this place, yet that you may see he spake according to the letter of the greeke coppy, and not his owne minde, he calleth all the Councells betwixt the 2. of Nice, and Florence, Generall Councells; all that the Church accounteth so; and particularly of this Councell of Lateran he sayth, *Institutæ generalis Concilij Lateranensis tempore Innocentij Papæ tertij.*

[a] *Præfat. huic Synod.*
[b] *Notis in Concil. Florent.*

In the end of this section you make this notable conclusion; *So that vnlesse they will make two eight generall Councells, this of Lateran could be none*; which out of your discourse may as iustly be inferred thus, so that vnlesse they will make two, or nine eight generall Councells, that of Constantinople the fourth, the fower of Lateran, the two of Lions, that of Vienne, that of Pisa, that of Florence, or some one of these could be

none. Could be none, is a falſe conſequence, could not be the eighth, is true; nor is that of Florence or Lateran numbred for the eighth by any Catholiques at this day, but this is reckoned the twelfth, that moſt commonly the ſixteenth. But that the number of eight, which you ſo hunt heere, may come in (becauſe *nos numeri ſumus*) he that firſt made this obiection (which I believe was not you) ſhall by my conſent be reckoned *Sapientum octauus*, *the eighth wiſe man*, which he ſhall be without a riuall, there ſhall not be two of them; eſpecially if he that next aſpires to it be a great one, for then (*I trow*) he cannot *interueene* in the order of number, betweene the eighth and the ninth, as you haue taught vs for our learning.

C.

Beſides, if it were a generall Councell, how came it to paſſe, that the Canons of it were neuer generally receiued? as amongſt vs in the Church and kingdome of England they were not, and as without doubt they would haue beene, had the

Councell in thoſe dayes beene accounted generall, and the Decrees of it vnder that ſtile and title ſent abroad into the world. But with vs in England euer ſince that time, and contrary to the 46. pretended Canon of it, ſubſidies haue beene payd to the king, inconſulto Pontifice; *and againſt the 41. Canon, with vs* Currit præſcriptio, *though oftentimes* ex bona fide ortum non habeat; *and yet againe contrary to the third Canon there, with vs*, Clericorum bona qui de hæreſi conuicti ſunt, *they goe not to the vſe of the Church, but are alwayes brought into the kings Exchequer.*

ANSWER.

The generality of this Councell you further goe about to diſproue, becauſe the Canons thereof were not (as you ſay) generally receiued; and this you proue, becauſe they were not receiued in England; but that they were not receiued in England you doe not proue, but by three inſtances, which you doe not proue; and if you had, they had proued nothing. For it is not properly the generall receiuing

that makes a Councell to be generall, but the generall calling thereof from all parts of the Christian world, and such was this. Otherwise no Councell could be stiled generall in the calling of it, or while it was sitting, or when it was concluded, vntill it did appeare that all the world had receiued it, which is a condition that neuer happened to any Councell, because some or other heretiques (against whom all generall Councells haue beene commonly called) or perhaps all, did refuse to receiue it. So that by this your character of a generall Councell, you haue plainly cashcired all the generall Councells that euer were; for euen the first fower, which you seeme to magnifie, and grant them the title of Generall, were the Canons of them generally receiued? It is manifest that they were not, but were reiected by all those sorts of heretiques who were the occasion of their calling.

Moreouer, your reason to proue that the canons of this Councell of

Lateran were not generally receiued to wit, becauſe they were not receiued in England; if it were true, yet it is inconſequent, and your deceipt or miſtake lyeth in the indiſtinction of the word *Canons*, whereof ſome be of faith, ſome of manners and diſcipline. Now that a Councell be accounted to be generally receiued, it is not required that the Canons of diſcipline and practiſe be receiued in all kingdomes, but it is ſufficient that the Canons concerning matters of faith be generally receiued, to ſtile the reception generall, and the Councell generall, for ſo much as the generality of reception can contribute to the title of its being generall. As for example, the kingdome of France doth not receiue the decrees of the Councell of Trent concerning gouernment, but of faith it doth, as doe all other Catholique Countries, for which reaſon, euen this kingdome which denies to receiue the Councell of Trent in matters of gouernment,

doth notwithſtanding acknowledge it generall. By which it appeares, that you are not ſo well verſed in Generall Councells and their reception, as to know diſtinctly the meaning of the words according to their Catholique vſe. Now there is no doubt that the kingdome of England did receiue this Councell for the matters of faith, otherwiſe it would haue beene noted hereticall as now it is, and for its not receiuing the Canons of diſcipline and gouernment, you proue not but by your owne bare word, which I may moſt iuſtly deny; yet I haue other proofes againſt you.

But firſt I will take notice of your miſtake (if not vnfaithfullneſſe) in your deſcription of the 46. *pretended* Canon (as you call it) contrary to which, you ſay, ſubſidies haue beene payd to the king, *inconſulto Pontifice*; as if that Canon had ſayd, that no ſubſidies at all ſhould be payd to the king but by the aduice of the Pope, whereas the Canon ſpeakes only of

the subsidies of the Clergy, as requiring the Popes aduice. As for the practise of England contrary to these three Canons you mention, if it be true (which I doe not beleiue, because I haue heard good lawyers in England say the contrary in one, which concernes prescription) yet it doth not proue that these Canons were not receiued; for these crossings of the Canons may happen, either through indulgence of the Pope granted to the kings, or the kings vsurpation contrary to the Canõs receiued; or in your instãce of prescription, through the headstrong impiety of the people, who will not obserue the good lawes they receiue, being contrary to their euill customes. If England had obserued all the Canõs they haue heeretofore receiued, when they were as wise, as learned, as pious, as iudicious (at the least) as now they are, you and I (I beleiue) should not haue beene at this bay, that now we are. Now contrary to your proofeleese assertion, I proue that the Canons of

this Councell were receiued in England, as well those of manners as of faith; first by the testimony of Linwood, and the municipall lawes of the land, as they are affirmed by *Franciscus à sancta Clara*, in his article of transubstantiation.

Secõdly by the Councell of Oxford before cited, held by the then Arch. Bishop of Canterbury, but seuen yeeres after this of Lateran, (which was the very first Councell in the world, that was held after this) where it is sayd, [a] *That all things may be concluded with a good end, wee enioyne that the Lateran Councell celebrated vnder Pope Innocent of holy memory, in the paying of tithes, and in the other chapters be obserued.* By which it appeares, how much you are deceiued, in saying that in England the Canons of this Councell were not receiued: as you also are in saying.

Binij tom. 7. part. 2. pag. 833.

C.

Lastly, I believe no good story can be shewed to confirme the pretended title of this Councell, that the Patriarch of Ierusalem

ruſalem and Conſtantinople were preſent at it, and 70. Metropolitans beſides; though that will not make it generall neither, for want of the two other Patriarchs of Antioche and Alexandria, who are not mentioned to haue beene among them. Howſoeuer, nihil ibi actum quod quidem conſtet; *and ſo was it neither any Generall Councell, nor ſo much as any Councell at all.*

ANSWER.

What you belieue imports not, for I know you belieue many hereſies and errors, amongſt which errors this is one, That no good ſtory can be shewed that the Patriarchs of Ieruſalem and Conſtantinople were preſent at this Councell &c. One is ſayd to be preſent either in perſon or by deputy; that thoſe two Patriarchs which you firſt mention, were there in perſon, is affirmed by Platina, Paris, and Vrſpergenſis; and that the other two were there by their deputies, with aboue 70. Metropolitanes, beſides a very great number of Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, and Priors, ſome in

perſon, and ſome by Proxy; and with theſe the Legats and deputies of the two Emperours, of all (or almoſt all) the Kings, Princes, cities and other places of the Chriſtian world, is recorded by Paris, and Vrſpergenſis. And I ſuppoſe you will not deny any of them to be good hiſtorians, eſpecially Paris and Platina, whom you called in, in the beginning of this your worke, as witneſſes (as you thought) againſt the Canons of this Councell. [a] Paris and Vrſpergẽſis ſpeake almoſt in the ſame words; [b] thus: *Anno ab Incarnatione Verbi* 1215. *celebrata eſt ſancta vniuerſalis Synodus Romæ, in Eccleſia Saluatoris, quæ Conſtantiniana vocatur, menſe Nouembri, præſidente Domino Innocentio Papa tertio, Pontificatus eius anno* 18. *in quo fuerunt Epiſcopi* 412. *inter quos extiterunt de præcipuis Patriarchis duo, videlicet, Conſtant: & Hieroſol: Antiochenus autem graui languore detentus, venire non potuit, ſed miſit pro ſe Vicarium, Anthedarenſem Epiſcopum: Alexandrinus vero ſub Saracenorum dominio conſtitutus, fecit quod po-*

[a] *Matth. Paris. hiſt. mai. p.* 188. *l. e.*

[b] *Vrſpergenſ. Chronic. p.* 320.

tuit, mittens pro se Diaconum suum Germanum; Primates autem & Metropolitani 71. cæterùm Abbates & Priores vltra octingentos; Archiepiscoporum vero & Episcoporum, Abbatum, & Priorum, & Capitulorum absentium Procuratorum non fuit certus numerus comprehensus. Legatorum vero Regis Siciliæ in Romanorum Imperatorem electi, Imperatoris Constantinopolitani, Regis Franciæ, Regis Angliæ, Regis Vngariæ, Regis Hierosolymitani, Regis Cypri, Regis Arragoniæ, necnon & aliorum Principum, & Magnatum ciuitatum, aliorumque locorum ingẽs fuit multitudo. Heere is your erroneous beliefe plainly and amply confuted. I wonder what histories you haue read concerning this Councell, that these should escape you; especially *Paris* the Popes deare friend, and *Platina the Popes owne Secretary.* I haue therfore reason to believe that you tooke vp these obiections vpon trust, and of men that were not faithfull, who haue greatly deceiued you. And therfore the title of this Councell which you againe so scornefully

and boldly call *pretended*, shall be really accounted Generall, by the beſt and nobleſt part of the world, the Catholique Church, when all other pretended Churches, Councells, and their Canons, their Biſhops, Deanes, and Chapters ſhall haue no being, nor memory but of diſhonour.

You further ſay, (according to your manner, without proofe,) that this Councell vas not Generall, for want of the perſonall preſence of two of the Patriarchs; wherein you are much miſtaken: for otherwiſe the firſt fower commonly ſtiled Generall, and for ſuch acknowledged by very many Proteſtants, cannot be truly ſuch, becauſe the Chiefe Patriarch, the Biſhop of Rome, was not preſent in any of them, but by his Legats. Vnleſſe you will ſay, that though two may not be abſent, yet one may, eſpecially when that one is the Pope, a man whō you (I know) can very well ſpare, not only out of the Councell, but out of the world. And yet I wonder that you that haue had the fortune to be

the pretended Deane of S. Peters Borough, and the pretended Maſter of S. Peters houſe, should yet be ſuch an enemy to S. Peters chayre. But if you deſire to know what makes a Councell generall, and what are the inſufficiencies thereof, which you ought to haue expreſſed and proued, before you had shot your haſty bolt of condemnation againſt this Councell, reade Turrecremata, and Canus vpon this ſubiect.

You at laſt conclude thus, Howſoeuer, *nihil ibi actum quod quidem conſtet*, and ſo was it neither any generall Councell, nor ſo much as any Councell at all. Wherein firſt your propoſition is falſe and hath no authority (that I know of) but the worſt in the world, your owne. Yet you ſet it downe in Latin, as if they were the words of ſome author, but neither expreſſe the place, nor ſo much as his name, and therfore I take it for yours, and reiect it. Secondly if it were true that nothing was done there, yet your inference from thence is incõſequent,

to wit, that therfore it was neither any generall Councell, nor so much as any Councell at all; concerning the nullities of a Councell, or of the generality therof, I need say no more than I haue done, seeing it rests on you to proue, that doing nothing is one. And for your affirmation that nothing was done, I haue fully disproued it through this whole discourse. I will therfore only adde the testimony of Matth. Paris, who though he were no friend to this Pope, as I haue shewed before, yet speaking of this Councell in the place aboue cited, saith thus: *His omnibus congregatis in suo loco præfato, & iuxta morem Conciliorum Generalium in suis ordinibus singulis collocatis, facto prius ab ipso Papa exhortationis sermone, recitata sunt in pleno Concilio capitula 60.* (wherein is a mistake in the figure, it should be 70.) *quæ aliis placabilia, aliis videbantur onerosa. Tandem de negotio Crucifixi & subiectione terræ sanctæ verbum prædicationis exorsus, subiunxit dicens, Ad hæc ne quid in negotio Ie-*

ſu Chriſti de cõtingentibus omittatur, volumus & mandamus, &c. And ſo repeats at large the ſubſtance of the Decree of the Expedition for the recouery of the Holy land. So that it is manifeſt by this, and that which hath beene ſayd before, that there were many things done in this Councell, yea all that are affirmed to bee. And it is called a Councell, and a generall Councell, by *Vrſpergenſis, Paris, Platina, Grantzius, Nauclerus, Beluacẽſis,* and all that I can finde that haue any way written therof, except your vncontrowlable ſelfe. Beſides it hath the allowance of the Holy Catholique Church, the awfull ſpouſe of Chriſt, more true, more wiſe, more vigilant, and infinitly more reuerend then all the ſects & Synagogues of Schiſmatiques, & Heretiques; & therfore their obiectiõs againſt her, whom they ought to belieue and reuerence aboue all things on the earth, eſpecially when they are propounded peremptorily, as theſe are, are fitter to be reiected than to be anſwered.

I conclude with the words of Surius: *a Nemo sanæ mentis ambigere potest, hanc quæ sequitur Synodum Lateranensem cum primis insignem & vere œcumenicam fuisse, quippe in qua de negotiis religionis summa Latinæ & Græcæ Ecclesia concordiâ tractatum est, cuique interfuere Patriarcha Constantinopolitanus, & Hierosolymitanus, & Archiepiscopi tum Latini tum Græci 70. Episcopi 412. Abbates & Priores plus 800. simul omnes Prælati 1215. aut eo plures. Nec defuere Legati Græci & Romani Imperatoris, Regum Hierusalem, Galliæ, Hispaniæ, Angliæ, & aliorum. Quod si verò ea cuiquam propterea minus ponderis habere videatur, quod recentior sit, ille certè Christum mendacem facere velle videtur, qui perennem præsentiam suam promisit Ecclesiæ suæ, & Spiritum sanctum suum, Spiritum veritatis, qui cum illa maneat in æternum. Manet sua semper Catholica Ecclesiæ authoritas, quam quisquis contemnere ausus est, non ille efficit vt ea minor sit, sed se dignum reddit, qui eius pondere penitus opprimatur.*

No man well in his wits can doubt, that

that this Councell of Lateran was very famous, and truly generall, because therein were handled the matters of Religiõ, with very great agreement of the Greeke and Latine Churches, & wherin were present the Patriarch of Constantinople, and Ierusalem, and 70. Archbishops Greeke and Latin, Bishops 412. Abbots and Priors aboue 800. all the Prelats together were one thousand two hundred and fifteene, or more. Neither were there absent the Ambassadours of the Greeke and Roman Emperours, of the kings of Ierusalem, France, Spayne, England, and others. But if this Councell seeme to any to haue lesse weight, because it is later, hee truly seemes to be willing to make Christ a lyar, who hath promised his perpetuall presence to his Church, and his Holy Spirit, the Spirit of truth, which remayneth with her for euer? The authority of the Catholique Church doth alwayes abide here, which who soeuer presumes to despise, he doth not lessen her, but renders himselfe worthy to be crushed to pieces with her weight.

And now insteed of your prouing

the Catholique writers lyars, and forgers, and the Catholique Church credulous, negligent, and ignorant (which you endeauoured) you haue proued your selfe, vnwise, vnlearned, and audacious; and I believe will loose all credit and reputation of integrity, or capacity, in the iudgement of all prudent men, of what religion soeuer they be, that shall reade these your vnworthy workes. But suppose the thing it selfe were true, that you haue laboured for (abstracting the authority to the contrary) to wit, that there had beene no Canons made in this Councell, yea suppose there had neuer beene any such thing as this Councell, what is it to your purpose? What article of our Catholique Faith is therby cancelled? how is your inuisible Church of England, or your Chappell in France (where God hath his Church) defended? Not at all, by ought that you haue sayd. No nor by your Mimique acting of the priest in hearing of confessions, (which wee perhaps shall heare too, at the third

or fourth hand, for as you haue no character of prieſthood for the hearing of Confeſſions, ſo neither haue you any ſeale vpō your lippes) wherby though like the *aſinus apud Cumanos* in the liōs skin, you bray & keepe ſome in awe, yet it may be they will be inſtructed to diſcouer you, and make your vayne aſpiring the obiect of their contempt and laughter, as it is of ours, and euen of all your fellow reformadoes. Your owne concluſion therfore which you diſcharge againſt us, recoyles vpon your ſelfe, *nihil ibi actum, quod quidē conſtet*; in all that you haue done, it is certaine that you haue done nothing. And your obiections and diſcourſe haue in them neither any generall counſell, nor (except the Counſell of the vngodly) ſo much as any counſell at all.

And now let mee tell you, that it were much more for your credit, to forbeare ſuch bold brauing of the whole Catholique Church, eſpecially in a Catholique Country, and in the Court of a Catholique Queene, and

that with ſuch feeble and vn-
ſchollerly arguments; of which,
(were not your iudgment eclipſed
by partiality, aud your paſſion ſwelld
by oppoſition, and your ouerweening
conceipt of your ſelfe the producer
of extraordinary confidence and in-
ſolence in you) you could not render
your ſelfe guilty. Alſo your pre-
ſumptuous and offenſiue language,
euen to the Maſters of thoſe ſchooles
wherein you are not worthy to be a
diſciple, is ſufficiently obſerued;
though couered with that patience
which you haue not deſerued;
Otherwiſe, your weakeneſſe, or ma-
lice, or both, would ere this haue
beene characterd on your brow,
had not the hands of our Catho-
lique Prieſts beene bound vp with mo-
deſty, and charity, and reſpect to
thoſe, who ſee, ſuffer, but (I believe
approue not your boyſterous beha-
uiour. And in this buſineſſe of
writing, your shame is layd open with
the bookes you cite, wherein your
quotations are not ſooner examined,

than your corruptions are discouered. If therfore you haue not grace enough to become a vertuous Roman Catholique, of which you made shew (as there is good proofe) when you came first into these parts, yet learne at least to be rationall in your discourse, honest in your allegations, and ciuill in your language, both to particular reuerend and learned men, and especially towards the whole Catholique Church. And then if you haue a disposition to say or write any more, you shall be answered with solidity, and equall ciuility.

And whereas one M. Crowder hath reported, that I haue renounced the booke I lately set forth, and will not stand to it; and that Doctor Holden who approued it for Catholique, hath also refused to iustify it; or words to this purpose; and giueth this for his reason, why hee doth not publish the answer which he and his Coadiutors (as it is sayd) haue framed thereunto: which is indeed but a retreate for their inability to answer

it; I ſay, it is falſe in him whoſoeuer ſaith it, and malicious in him that inuented it. And I further profeſſe to him and to the world, that (notwithſtanding the ſlanders to the contrary) I doe auow the ſayd booke for mine, and for Catholique, and ſo doth Doctor Holden. And if he, or any, or all his fellow Miniſters, will publish any thing that they will call an anſwer thervnto, they shall not looſe their labour, they shall haue a reply; wherein I make no queſtion their weakneſſe shall be made to appeare, as herein appeareth the weakneſſe of D. Coſens.

FINIS.

IF D. Cosens, or any one on his behalfe, shall say that I haue not heere set downe truly what he wrote; whosoeuer desires to be satisfied therein, may if he please see the originall vnder his owne hand, which is in my keeping. And although his name be not set to it, yet euery one that knowes his hand, will grant he wrote it, and the Countesse of Denbigh by whose order I receiued it, sayd that it was deliuered to her by Doctor Cosens. Which paper, and others of his also (he inwardly shrinking at his owne guilt) hath mightily laboured to recall into his owne hands, that soe there might remayne no handwriting of his owne against him; but it was not fit that one of his temper should finde so much fauour, but that they should remayne vpon the perpetuall registry of time, by being committed to the presse; seeing he hath deserued to haue part of the diuine handwriting against

him, that was against the blasphemous Baltazar; THEKEL, *Thou art weighed in a ballance, and art found too light.*

E RATA.

15. in the margent oner against the line, put, *pag.* 877. *C.* p. 16. This uotation in the margent [vol. 2. p. 15.] place it six lines higher. p. 39. . 24. after *see it*, adde, *or seeing it.* p. 40. l. 19. for *yea.* read, *yet.* p. 52. l. 12. for *explication*, read, *duplication.* p. 60. l. 3. before *exprest*, read, *is* p. 64. l. 14. after *vnionis*, adde, *& in diuers other Councells.* p. 66. l. 13. after *intention of it*, adde, but of the execution, which was not certaine, nor likely; and for *but* read *because.* p. 68. l. 10 after iniustus draw a little line. p. 91 l. 10. after *bee* adde, *done.* p. 93. l. 23. for *here*, read *hers.* p. 37. l. 14. for *foure* read *fine.* p. 77. l. 26. leaue out these words, That of Pisa.